1	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332) United States Attorney
2 3	BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division
4 5 6 7 8	OWEN P. MARTIKAN (CSBN 177104) Assistant United States Attorneys  450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7241 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 owen.martikan@usdoj.gov  Attorneys for Plaintiff
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
13 14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) CR 09-0033 WHA
15	Plaintiff, STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
16	) ORDER EXCLUDING TIME v.
17	JEFFREY D. SCHINKEL,
18 19	Defendant.
20	
21	On May 5, 2009, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for identification of
22	counsel and a detention hearing. The parties stipulated and the Court agreed that time should be
23	excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from May 5, 2009, through May 19, 2009, for
24	effective preparation of defense counsel, due to the government's delay in providing discovery to
25	the defense. The parties represented that granting the continuance would allow the reasonable
26	time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of
27	due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of
28	justice is served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME [CASE NO. CR 09-0033 WHA]

the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). 1 2 SO STIPULATED: 3 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO United States Attorney 4 /s/5 DATED: May 19, 2009 OWEN P. MARTIKAN **Assistant United States Attorney** 6 7 /s/DATED: May 19, 2009 8 EDWIN K. PRATHER 9 Attorney for Jeffrey D. Schinkel 10 [PROPOSED] ORDER 11 As the Court found on May 5, 2009, and for the reasons stated above, an exclusion of 12 time from May 5, 2009, through May 19, 2009, is warranted because the ends of justice served 13 by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 14 See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(7)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny 15 defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the 16 17 exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). 18 19 IT IS SO ORDERED SO ORDERED. 20 21 22 May 20, 2009 Judge William Alsup DATED: 23 s District Judge 24 25 26 27 28